



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,575	02/08/2002	Marc A. Smith	1026-052/MMM	2608

27662 7590 04/01/2005

LYON & HARR, LLP  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800  
OXNARD, CA 93036

EXAMINER
----------

KOROBV, VITALI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/071,575	SMITH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Vitali Korobov	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1- 37 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 18 as recited is directed to data structure per se. Although the claim recites data structure comprising aggregated conversation data from the one or more conversations, the claim lacks limitations to indicate as to how the data structure's functionalities (i.e., functional interrelationship between the data structure and software that permits the data structure's functionality to be realized) are realized. See MPEP 2106.IV.B.1.(a).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention, because claim 18 recites both a system and a data structure in the preamble, while in the body, it claims what is to be stored in the data structure. It is unclear whether the claim is

Art Unit: 2155

directed to a system or to a data structure. If the claim is directed to a data structure, then the invention as claimed is directed to data structure per se. Claim 18 fails to indicate as to how the data structure's functionalities (i.e., functional interrelationship between the data structure and software that permits the data structure's functionality to be realized) are realized. See MPEP 2106.IV.B.1.(a).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16 – 19, 21, 23, 25, 28, 29, 31, 34 - 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062368 A1 by Holtzman, David et al. (hereinafter Holtzman).

With respect to claim 1, Holtzman teaches a computer mediated persistent conversation system having one or more computers with which each of multiple users author and post messages in one or more conversations, the system including a computer-readable medium that stores computer software instructions for operating the system, the improvement comprising: computer software instructions stored on the computer-readable medium for obtaining selected information from the one or more

Art Unit: 2155

conversations (Fig. 1, item 12, §0050, lines 7 – 8); computer software instructions stored on the computer-readable medium for storing the selected information and forming from it aggregated conversation data that includes aggregations according to time, conversation, and authoring user (§0050, lines 9 – 13, §0110); and computer software instructions stored on the computer-readable medium for providing the aggregated conversation data to users of the computer mediated persistent conversation system (Fig. 1, item 14; §0075, lines 1 - 7, as per definition of aggregation in §0027 of instant application).

With respect to claim 2, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which the computer mediated persistent conversation system includes any of Usenet (NNTP) newsgroups, World Wide Web (HTTP) message or bulletin board sites, email lists, or online chat rooms (§0005, lines 17 – 20 and §0006, lines 1-14).

With respect to claim 3, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which the computer mediated persistent conversation system includes Usenet (NNTP) newsgroups (§0049 lines 9 – 12).

With respect to claim 4, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which the aggregated conversation data includes plural aggregations according to plural time periods or resolutions (§0011, lines 4 – 14 – time summary statistics; §0110 - §0111 – grouping and aggregation).

With respect to claim 6, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which the aggregated conversation data includes plural aggregations according to plural

Art Unit: 2155

conversation characteristics or identifiers. (§0011, lines 1 – 5 – assigning plurality of identifiers; §0110 – aggregation).

With respect to claim 8, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1, in which the aggregated conversation data includes plural aggregations according to plural authoring user characteristics or identifiers (§§0033 – 0042 - plural authoring user characteristics or identifiers, §0110 - aggregation).

With respect to claim 10, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which one or more reply messages respond to an initial message and the aggregated conversation data provided to users includes an indication of a fraction of an authoring user's messages that are replies in a selected one of the conversations relative to the authoring user's reply messages in all of the conversations (§0011, lines 2 – 14).

With respect to claim 11, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which one or more reply messages respond to an initial message and the aggregated conversation data provided to users includes an indication of a number of replies by an authoring user and a number of initial messages to which replies are posted (§0011, lines 1 – 14; §0012, lines 8 – 13).

With respect to claim 13, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which the one or more conversations include messages posted by authoring users, the system further comprising computer software instructions stored on the computer-readable medium for tagging or identifying the messages when they are posted by authoring users as being of one or more selected message types (§0045, §0046, §0048; §§0075, lines 3 – 14).

With respect to claim 16, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 13 in which one or more reply messages respond to an initial message, the one or more selected message types including a Closed message type indicating that a selected reply message resolves the initial message (§0035 – Final message posted by the Moderator).

With respect to claim 17, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which the aggregated conversation data are provided to users as a profile that references a selected user or a conversation (§0011, lines 4 – 14, §0012 – last sentence, §§0033 – 0042 – user profiles, §0049, lines 16 – 26).

With respect to claim 18, Holtzman teaches, in a computer mediated persistent conversation system having one or more computers with which each of multiple users author and post messages in one or more conversations (Fig.1), the system including a computer-readable medium that stores computer software instructions for operating the system, a data structure stored on the computer-readable medium (Fig. 1, Central data store 20), comprising: aggregated conversation data from the one or more conversations (Fig. 1, Message collection and categorization); and including aggregations according to time, conversation, and authoring user, and representing participant evaluation characteristics for a selected user or conversation (§0011, lines 4 – 14 – user profiling and conversation summary statistics, §§0110 – 0111 – grouping and aggregation). Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it recites a data structure to be stored on a computer readable medium wherein the medium is read by a general purpose computer. The general purpose computer, when used in

Art Unit: 2155

conjunction with the data structure, is converted into a specific machine such as a computer mediated persistent conversation system as recited in claim 1. Therefore claim 18 is further rejected for the same reasons as applied to claim 1 because a program with data structure can always be loaded into a general purpose computer.

With respect to claim 19, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 18 in which the data structure includes plural aggregations according to plural time periods or resolutions. (§0011, lines 4 – 14 – time summary statistics; §0075, lines 3 – 13, grouping, categorization and storage).

Claims 21 and 23 are essentially the same as claims 6 and 8, respectively, in view of the rationale given regarding data structure in rejection of claim 18. Therefore, claims 21 and 23 are rejected under the same rationale as respective claims 6 and 8 above.

With respect to claim 25, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 18 in which the one or more conversations include messages posted by authoring users, the data structure further comprising a message type identifier for identifying the messages when they are posted by authoring users as being of one or more selected message types (§0045, §0046, §0048; §0075, lines 3 – 14).

With respect to claim 28, Holtzman teaches the system of 25 in which one or more reply messages respond to an initial message, the one or more selected message types including a Closed message type indicating that a selected reply message resolves the initial message (§0035 – Final message posted by the Moderator).



With respect to claim 29, Holtzman teaches in a computer mediated persistent conversation system having one or more computers with which each of multiple users author and post messages in one or more conversations, the system including a computer-readable medium that stores computer software instructions for operating the system, a user interface rendered on the display screens, comprising: one or more indications of aggregated conversation data from the one or more conversations and including aggregations according to time, conversation, and authoring user (§§0110-0111, §0122, lines 3 – 8 – display information to end user).

With respect to claim 31, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 29 in which the one or more conversations include messages posted by authoring users, the user interface further comprising one or more indications for identifying the messages when they are posted by authoring users as being of one or more selected message types (§0045, §0046, §0048; §§0075, lines 3 – 14, §0122, lines 3 – 8 – display information to end user).

With respect to claim 34, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 31 in which one or more reply messages respond to an initial message, the one or more selected message types including a Closed message type indicating that a selected reply message resolves the initial message (§0035 – Final message posted by the Moderator).

With respect to claim 35, Holtzman teaches in a computer mediated persistent conversation system having one or more computers with which each of multiple users author and post messages in one or more conversations, a method comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

obtaining selected information from the one or more conversations (§0050, lines 9 – 13); storing the selected information and forming from it aggregated conversation data that includes aggregations according to time, conversation, and authoring user (§0110, §0111); and providing the aggregated conversation data to users of the computer mediated persistent conversation system (§0122, lines 3 – 8).

With respect to claim 36, Holtzman teaches the method of claim 35 in which the computer mediated persistent conversation system includes any of Usenet (NNTP) newsgroups, World Wide Web (HTTP) message or bulletin board sites, email lists, or online chat rooms. (§0005, lines 17 – 20 and §0006, lines 1-14).

With respect to claim 37, Holtzman teaches the method of claim 35 in which the computer mediated persistent conversation system includes Usenet (NNTP) newsgroups (§0049 lines 9 – 12).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 7, 9, 12, 20, 22, 24, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062368 A1 by Holtzman, David et al. (hereinafter Holtzman) in view of U. S. Patent 6250930 by Mintz, Alex (hereinafter Mintz).

Claim 5 further limits the scope of claim 4 by aggregating the conversation data according to two or more time periods or resolution such as both day and week.

Holtzman teaches aggregation along time dimension (such as in page 9, §0116, “for a given date”), however does not explicitly indicate two different types of time periods such as “day” and “week” in the time dimension. Holtzman also teaches regression analysis by correlating multiple sets of data (page 12, §0152) to facilitate market analysis (page 9, §0126). Mintz, an analogous art that deals with analyzing e-mail messages for facilitating market analysis (Col. 10, lines 40-45, and 55-57), suggests that a plurality of time periods (and/or granularities) can be used in the time dimension during analysis (see specifically col. 10, lines 39-41). Mintz, in general, directed to enhancing of surveying technique wherein data to be surveyed may be received through e-mails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Holtzman and Mintz to enhance market analysis with new tools as well as with flexibility (See Mintz, col. 1, lines 33-39). By incorporating the plurality of time periods or resolutions of Mintz in Holtzman users will be able to use a wide variety of time periods/resolutions and thus automate and improve the quality of market analysis (Mintz, page 2, lines 60-67).

With respect to claim 7, it further limits the scope of claim 6 by claiming that plural conversations are related by plural hierarchical levels of organization and further claiming plural aggregations according to two or more of the hierarchical levels of organization. Holtzman teaches the system of claim 6 in which plural conversations are related by plural hierarchical levels of organization (Fig. 3), storage of conversations

Art Unit: 2155

according to plural characteristics or identifiers information with respect to plural conversation identifiers (§§0044, 0045, 0046), and message categorization according to a plurality of pre-determined rules (§0012, lines 8 – 10). Holtzman further teaches regression analysis by correlating multiple sets of data (page 12, §0152) to facilitate market analysis (page 9, §0126), but does not explicitly teach plural aggregations according to two or more of the hierarchical levels of organization. Mintz, an analogous art that deals with analyzing e-mail messages for facilitating market analysis (Col. 10, lines 40-45, and 55-57), suggests aggregation according to two or more of the hierarchical levels of organization. (See specifically col. 10, lines 29 – 33, “small picture” vs. “big picture”, and store vs. salesperson aggregations). Mintz, in general, directed to enhancing of surveying technique wherein data to be surveyed may be received through e-mails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Holtzman and Mintz to enhance market analysis with new tools as well as with flexibility (See Mintz, col. 1, lines 33-39). By incorporating aggregations according to the plurality of hierarchical levels of organization of Mintz in Holtzman, users will be able to further enhance and improve the quality of market analysis (Mintz, page 2, lines 60-67).

With respect to claim 9, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 8 in which the plural authoring user characteristics or identifiers correspond to plural hierarchical levels of authoring user identifier (§§0033 - 0042), but does not explicitly teach the plural aggregations according to plural authoring user characteristics or identifiers including aggregations according to two or more of the hierarchical levels of authoring user

Art Unit: 2155

identifier. Aggregation Engine of Mintz provides analytical tools to perform such aggregations by user characteristics or identifiers (Col. 10, lines 29 – 33). Therefore, claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 above.

With respect to claim 12, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 1 in which one or more reply messages respond to an initial message. Holtzman does not explicitly teach the aggregated conversation data provided to users includes an indication of a number of days on which an authoring user posted a message in a selected one of the one or more conversations relative to a number of days on which an authoring user posted a message in any of the one or more conversations. Mintz, an analogous art that deals with analyzing e-mail messages for facilitating market analysis (Col. 10, lines 40-45, and 55-57), suggests that a plurality of time periods (and/or granularities) can be used in the time dimension during analysis (see specifically col. 10, lines 39-41). Mintz, in general, directed to enhancing of surveying technique wherein data to be surveyed may be received through e-mails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Holtzman and Mintz to enhance market analysis with new tools as well as with flexibility (See Mintz, col. 1, lines 33-39). By incorporating the plurality of time periods or resolutions of Mintz in Holtzman users will be able to use a wide variety of time periods/resolutions and thus automate and improve the quality of market analysis (Mintz, page 2, lines 60-67).

Claim 20 further limits the scope of claim 19 by aggregating the conversation data according to two or more time periods or resolution such as both day and week. Holtzman teaches aggregation along time dimension (such as in page 9, §0116, “for a

Art Unit: 2155

given date”), however does not explicitly indicate two different types of time periods such as “day” and “week” in the time dimension. Holtzman also teaches regression analysis by correlating multiple sets of data (page 12, §0152) to facilitate market analysis (page 9, §0126). Mintz, an analogous art that deals with analyzing e-mail messages for facilitating market analysis (Col. 10, lines 40-45, and 55-57), suggests that a plurality of time periods (and/or granularities) can be used in the time dimension during analysis (see specifically col. 10, lines 39-41). Mintz, in general, directed to enhancing of surveying technique wherein data to be surveyed may be received through e-mails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Holtzman and Mintz to enhance market analysis with new tools as well as with flexibility (See Mintz, col. 1, lines 33-39). By incorporating the plurality of time periods or resolutions of Mintz in Holtzman users will be able to use a wide variety of time periods/resolutions and thus automate and improve the quality of market analysis (Mintz, page 2, lines 60-67).

Claims 22 and 24 are essentially the same as claims 7 and 9, respectively, in view of the rationale given regarding data structure in rejection of claim 18. Therefore, claims 22 and 24 are rejected under the same rationale as respective claims 7 and 9 above.

With respect to claim 30, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 29. Holtzman does not explicitly teach the additional limitations of claim 30 in which the user interface provides indications of plural aggregations according to plural time periods or resolutions. Mintz teaches the system in which the user interface provides indications of

Art Unit: 2155

plural aggregations according to plural time periods or resolutions (Col. 10, lines 38 – 42). Holtzman and Mintz are analogous art because they are both related to a system for facilitating the message and information exchange between human users in a networked computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system as taught by Holtzman with the aggregation engine taught by Mintz to enhance its value (Mintz, col. 9, lines 60 – 61).

6. Claims 14, 15, 26, 27, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062368 A1 by Holtzman, David et al. (hereinafter Holtzman) and further in view of U. S. Patent 5948054 by Nielsen, Jakob (hereinafter Nielsen).

With respect to claim 14, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 13. Holtzman does not explicitly teach the additional limitations of claim 13 in which the one or more selected message types include a Question message type indicating that a message is a question and an Answer message type indicating that a message is an answer to a Question message type. Nielsen teaches a system in which the one or more selected message types include a Question message type indicating that a message is a question and an Answer message type indicating that a message is an answer to a Question message type (Fig. 8A – Question message type processing, Fig. 11 – Answer message type processing).

With respect to claim 15, Holtzman/Nielsen combination teaches the system of claim 14. Nielsen further teaches additional limitations of the system in claim 15 in

Art Unit: 2155

which the one or more selected message types include a Closed message type indicating that a message of the Answer message type resolves a message of the Question message type (Col. 4, lines 60 – 62).

With respect to claims 14 and 15, Holtzman and Nielsen are analogous art because they are both related to a system for facilitating the message and information exchange between human users in a networked computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system as taught by Holtzman and the system taught by Nielsen in order to facilitate an improved method and system for matching customers with questions to consultants with answers (Nielsen, col. 2, lines 42 – 44).

With respect to claim 26, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 25. Holtzman does not explicitly teach the additional limitations of claim 26 in which the one or more selected message types include a Question message type indicating that a message is a question and an Answer message type indicating that a message is an answer to a Question message type. Nielsen teaches a system in which the one or more selected message types include a Question message type indicating that a message is a question and an Answer message type indicating that a message is an answer to a Question message type (Fig. 8A – Question message type processing, Fig. 11 – Answer message type processing).

With respect to claim 27, Holtzman/Nielsen combination teaches the system of claim 26. Nielsen further teaches additional limitations of the system of claim 26 in which the one or more selected message types include a Closed message type



Art Unit: 2155

indicating that a message of the Answer message type resolves a message of the Question message type (Col. 4, lines 60 – 62).

With respect to claims 26 and 27, Holtzman and Nielsen are analogous art because they are both related to a system for facilitating the message and information exchange between human users in a networked computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system as taught by Holtzman and the system taught by Nielsen in order to facilitate an improved method and system for matching customers with questions to consultants with answers (Nielsen, col. 2, lines 42 – 44).

With respect to claim 32, Holtzman teaches the system of claim 31. Holtzman does not explicitly teach the additional limitations of claim 32 in which the one or more selected message types include a Question message type indicating that a message is a question and an Answer message type indicating that a message is an answer to a Question message type. Nielsen teaches a system in which the one or more selected message types include a Question message type indicating that a message is a question and an Answer message type indicating that a message is an answer to a Question message type (Fig. 8A – Question message type processing, Fig. 11 – Answer message type processing).

With respect to claim 33, Holtzman/Nielsen combination teaches the system of claim 32. Nielsen further teaches additional limitations of the system of claim 33 in which the one or more selected message types includes a Closed message type

Art Unit: 2155

indicating that a message of the Answer message type resolves a message of the Question message type (Col. 4, lines 60 – 62).

With respect to claims 32 and 33, Holtzman and Nielsen are analogous art because they are both related to a system for facilitating the message and information exchange between human users in a networked computer system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system as taught by Holtzman and the system taught by Nielsen in order to facilitate an improved method and system for matching customers with questions to consultants with answers (Nielsen, col. 2, lines 42 – 44).

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

U. S. Patent No. 5799151 by Hoffer, Steven. The patent is considered pertinent to the applicant disclosure because it teaches an interactive trade network is described that integrates distributive messaging using a host computer and telecommunication networks, real-time interactive communications, a hierarchical knowledge matrix containing two familiar and comprehensive indices of classes of goods and classes of establishments and a legend of trade-related, cross-reference terms or

Art Unit: 2155

parameters, a multiline programmable application, an integrated application program interface, and integrated application programs.

U. S. Patent No. 6557027 B1 by Cragun, Brian. The patent is considered pertinent to the applicant disclosure because it teaches a system and method for managing on-line discussion having multiple topics in a collaborative data processing environment.

U. S. Patent No. 6493703 B1 by Knight, Timothy. The patent is considered pertinent to the applicant disclosure because it teaches a system and method for implementing intelligent online community message board.

U. S. Patent No. 6480885 B1 by Olivier, Michael. The patent is considered pertinent to the applicant disclosure because it teaches a system for dynamically matching users for group communications based on a threshold degree of matching of sender and recipient predetermined acceptance criteria.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vitali Korobov whose telephone number is 571-272-7506. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 8a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vitali Korobov  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2155

03/26/2005  
VAK

  
HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER